# TOMALES BAY STATE PARK GENERAL PLAN

# ENVIRONMENTAL (INITIAL STUDY) CHECKLIST

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	AF	ESTHETICS. Would the project:				
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime view in the area?	//s			
CON	ИMЕ	ENTS:				
aestl on tl miti	incl hetic ne sit gatio	uis area is known for its scenic beauty and expansive vude structures, parking lots, picnic areas, lighting, tra resources when such proposals might be developed. ting of facilities and materials chosen. The general plon for any potentially adverse impacts to aesthetic resophases as funding becomes available, and these propositions.	ils, etc.) have the p Potentially signifi- lan will propose ap ources. Future im- osals will be subject	potential for adve- icant adverse imporpropriate goals, golementation of good to additional (ti- Less than Significant	rse impacts to sen acts may occur de guidelines, and po eneral plan propo ered) environmen	sitive epending otential sals will ntal review
			Significant Impact	with Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	<b>A</b> (	GRICULTURAL RESOURCES.				
	are refe Site Dej	determining whether impacts to agricultural resources significant environmental effects, lead agencies may er to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and e Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the Californ partment of Conservation as an optional model for us assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland.	iia			
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmla Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment				$\boxtimes$

which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

# COMMENTS:

The park project will not conflict with existing zoning or cause the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	ΑI	R QUALITY.				
	the	nere available, the significance criteria established by applicable air quality management or air pollution atrol district may be relied on to make the following erminations.				
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individua with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?				
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
COM	4ME	ENTS:				
visita	orar atior oach	tis project will comply with all applicable air quality pry short-term impacts to air quality. The project may in to the park, thus increasing the local concentration on to environmental review. The development of any formal environmental review.	provide expanded of vehicle emission	d recreational facilins. This project is	lities that may inc s a general plan, v	rease vith a tiered
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BI	OLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project	ect:			
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Servic	□ e?			

			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identifie in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	□ ed			
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
	f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<u> </u>			
CON	ΜМЕ	ENTS:				
pote appr reso plan	or fa ntial opria urces prop	ere are sensitive species and habitats within and adjace cility additions and improvements as well as increased adverse impacts on sensitive plants, wildlife, and habitate goals, guidelines, and mitigation measures that will so this project is a general plan, with a tiered approach cosals will occur in phases as funding becomes available mental review.	I recreation oppositats in the park. I minimize all position to environment	ortunities and land The general plan otential impacts to tal review. Future	use changes that a will also propose sensitive biologic implementation of	may have cal of general
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CU	JLTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5?	е			
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significanc of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5?	е 🗌			
	c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				

Less than

## COMMENTS:

Tomales Bay State Park contains a variety of sensitive cultural resources. Facility improvement, increased recreation opportunities, and land use changes have the potential to adversely impact these resources. The general plan will propose appropriate goals, guidelines, and mitigation measures that will minimize all potential impacts to significant cultural resources. The development of any future facilities based on general plan proposals will be subject to additional environmental review.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. G	<b>EOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a)	<ul> <li>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</li> <li>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)</li> </ul>				
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	$\boxtimes$			
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
	iv) Landslides?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstabl or that would become unstable, as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	е, 🗌			
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997 creating substantial risks to life or property?	),			
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?				

Tomales Bay State Park is in a seismically active zone, with numerous known faults in the vicinity, including the San Andreas fault passing through Tomales Bay. Some park properties include land that is on fill material with the potential for instability during seismic events. Other areas of the park include very steep terrain with the potential for landslides. Changes in topography and soil disturbance due to park maintenance, construction, or rehabilitation of facilities has the potential for erosion and unstable soil conditions. The general plan will propose appropriate goals, guidelines, and mitigation measures that will minimize all potential impacts. This project is a general plan, with a tiered approach to environmental review. Future implementation of general plan proposals will occur in phases as funding becomes available, and these proposals will be subject to additional (tiered) environmental review.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIA	LS.			
7	Would the project:				
8	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
ł	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?				
(	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
(	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?				
6	Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	1			
f	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
£	g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	n 🗌			
ł	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of lo injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	ss,			

The park and surrounding lands are highly susceptible to wildland fires. The general plan will develop goals and guidelines necessary to develop future fire management plans. All regulations for hazardous material transport, use, and disposal will be adhered to. The development of any future facilities based on general plan proposals will be subject to additional environmental review.

		otentially ignificant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	IYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
W	Vould the project:				
<b>a</b> )	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
<b>c</b> )	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?				
ď	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding?	<u></u>			
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainag systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f)	Substantially degrade water quality?		$\boxtimes$		
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h)	. 11. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1				
i)		s, 🗌			
j)	Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	$\boxtimes$			

Bordering many of the park's properties, the waters of Tomales Bay are an extremely sensitive resource. Proposed land use changes and the addition or relocation of visitor facilities have the potential to adversely impact water quality through both point and non-point sources. The general plan will propose goals and guidelines that recommend actions to reduce sources of potential water pollution. Future implementation of general plan proposals will occur in phases as funding becomes available, and these proposals will be subject to additional (tiered) environmental review.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proj	ject:			
	a) Physically divide an established community?				$\boxtimes$
	b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
	c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$
COM	MENTS:				
plans	This effort will produce a general plan for Tomales Bay lopment. The proposals in this plan will be compatible with the plan and environmental impact report is the first the training proposals will occur in phases as funding become and environmental review.	vith state, region ier of environm	nal, and local land us ental analysis. Futu	se regulations, po re implementatio	licies, and n of
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
	b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				
COM	IMENTS:				
	This state park property is not known to contain any sign approach to environmental review. The development of the additional environmental review.				
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	NOISE. Would the project:				
	a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?				
	b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborn vibrations or groundborne noise levels?	e 🗌			
	c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)?				
	d)	Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?				
	e)	Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
	f)	Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	the			
COM	ME	ENTS:				
gener	al p	measures to minimize excessive noise levels from recolan proposals will occur in phases as funding become invironmental review.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	Pl	UBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
	a)	Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
		Fire protection?				
		Police protection?				$\boxtimes$
		Schools?				$\boxtimes$
		Parks?				$\boxtimes$
		Other public facilities?				$\boxtimes$
0014	n (1	NITO.				

A potential increase in the amount, access, or use of facilities may increase the fire danger. This may result in a potential increase in fire protection services. The development of any future facilities based on general plan proposals will be subject to additional environmental review.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	RE	CREATION. Would the project:				
8	1	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
l	1	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
COMM	1EN	NTS:				
of exist	ting	recommendations may affect existing recreational recreational areas. The development of any future environmental review.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	TR	ANSPORATION/TRAFFIC. Would the p	roject:			
8	a)	Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
l	b)	Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
(	c)	Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?				
(	d)	Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that would substantially increase hazards?				
•	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				$\boxtimes$
f	f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			$\boxtimes$	
£	g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				

Enhanced future facilities may result in increased visitor use. Parking capacity may be increased in some areas to enhance visitor access and use. Parking capacity in other areas of the park may be reduced or relocated to enhance or restore natural resource values. This project is a general plan, with a tiered approach to environmental review. Future

implementation of general plan proposals will occur in phases as funding becomes available, and these proposals will be subject to additional (tiered) environmental review.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	.U	TILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
	W	ould the project:				
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
	b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?				
		Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?				
	c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?				
		Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?				
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
	e)	Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatmed provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
	g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?				
COM	ME	NTS:				
draina will p	ige :	e plan may recommend new or expanded facilities for facilities will comply with all applicable regulations at ose goals, guidelines, and potential mitigation that will cilities based on general plan proposals will be subject	nd policies wi 1 minimize im	th regard to water qual pacts to water quality.	ity. In addition	n, the plan
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI	I.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICATION	ICANCE.			
	W	ould the project:		_		
	a)	Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment?				
	b)	Have the potential to substantially reduce the				

	habitat of any fish or wildlife species?			
c)	Have the potential to cause any fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels?		$\boxtimes$	
d)	Have the potential to threaten or eliminate any plant or animal community?	$\boxtimes$		
e)	Have the potential to reduce the number or restrict the range of any rare, protected, special, or endangered plant or animal?			
f)	Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			
g)	Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)			
h)	Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?			